

REMARKS

Reconsideration by the Examiner of his restriction requirement is respectfully requested in light of the above amendment to dependent claim 14 and the following comments.

Initially Applicant elects the claims of Group I, Claims 1-13, drawn to a process. The election is made with traverse.

It is submitted that dependent claims 14 and 15 are improperly restricted from claims 1-13. The Examiner indicates that there is no link between the two claimed inventions. The Examiner asserts that claim 1 is either obvious or anticipated by EP 0580565; however, such a rejection has not been made by the Examiner. Claims 14 and 15 now depend from process claim 3 which sets forth the enlargement factor for a pre-produced blank which blank is the subject matter of dependent claims 14 and 15. Accordingly, it is submitted that a link is clearly established and, therefore, the Examiner's restriction requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

An early action on the merits is respectfully requested.

If any fees are required in connection with this case, it is respectfully requested that they be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-0184.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANK FILSER ET AL.

By 


~~Gregory P. LaPointe~~
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 28,395
Tel: (203) 777-6628
Fax: (203) 865-0297

Date: November 27, 2001

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original as submitted to the court.

November 27, 2001

Lori J. Larson



11-27-01

Date of Signature

14. (Twice amended) Blank (48) of porous ceramic for performance of the process according to claim [1] 3, characterised in that on the blank (48) itself, its packing, an attachment label or a packing leaflet, is applied an information code (C) legible by machine or with human sensory organs, with data for individual input of the compensating enlargement factor (f).